

/79 cont. /

sometimes I am afraid I betrayed what to them were incredible gaps in the most ordinary education.

The most difficult problem lay in the verbs, and, to be sure, not only because of the complication of forms. If I succeeded in writing down short sentences in which something was said about an occurrence that was just going on, even if I myself performed all kinds of actions, such as eating and drinking now of this, now of that, which were supposed to give them the content of a sentence, /80/ gross errors were nevertheless unavoidable. Unfortunately, they often said things that were different from what they were supposed to say according to my request and criticized the action instead of naming it. They were thinking for themselves and not for me. And in these efforts their readiness to imitate was disturbing to a high degree. I thought nothing would be easier than to obtain at least those intransitive verbs that could be evoked by unequivocal mimicry on my part; I would indeed need only to sneeze, cough, weep, yawn, snore, only to get up, sit down, to fall, and so forth, in order to be immediately rewarded with the matching words. But they either clung to the contemplation of the process itself, thought I wanted to go away when I stood up, righteously joined in when I yawned, because they, too, were tired, or were royally amused at my strange doings, and, amidst much laughter, would likewise abandon themselves to sneezing, coughing, and snoring, without, however, saying the redeeming words.

I made the best progress when I gave them the Portuguese word and applied the formula: the Karaibe says it thus, how does the Bakairi say it? Here I finally almost always met with understanding and response, for they were mad about learning my language.

They were very grieved that they did not understand me better, and, confusing hearing and understanding, they asked me to cure them. I had to put saliva on my fingers and with it rub the auditory entrance for them. Their comprehension of Portuguese was even more deficient than they themselves realized. They have

126
192
536
825

126
192
153

[81]

151
191
194

/81 cont./

192 The real poverty is in the lack of superordinate concepts,
 811 as among all primitive peoples. They have a word for "bird," which probably means "winged," but the North Karaiben have another stem toro- or tono-, which among the Bakaïf also means very ordinary birds, a species of parrot or wild chicken /Waldhuhn/. Each parrot has its particular name and the more general concept of "parrot" is completely lacking, just as the concept "palm" is lacking. They know the characteristics of each parrot and palm species very precisely, however, and cling so to these numerous individual facts that they pay no attention to the common features, which, to be sure, have no interest. Thus, one sees that their poverty is only a poverty of higher units; they are choked by the mass of material and cannot handle it economically. They deal only in small change, but in the number of pieces in their possession they should be called superrich rather than poor. In building up their thoughts they set their ideas together like an endless wall of uniform stones and as yet have scarcely any notion of architectonic structure.

811 Their ineptness at forming abstractions came out most clearly in my efforts with regard to their art of counting. About this,
 128 however, I should like to report later in a separate chapter, so that now I may finally take up once more the thread of our travel chronicle and return to Independencia, to my traveling companions. In my description of my Bakaïf idyl I have been very detailed to some extent, but will thus be saved many details in the later portrayal, since the picture among the other tribes was essentially the same, even though I was never again able to enjoy it so quietly.

/176 cont./

* 171 well-meaning advice that I should pluck it out. The lashes re-
 302 moved so radically would not by any means grow scantily, as is
 proved by the magnificent lashes of the "docile" Indians. /Pl.
 XIV appears here:/ /177/ Moreover, the grooming of the beard
 was by far the most neglected, and thus the custom of removing
 the hair probably did not start with it.

Regarding the pubic hair, which only the Suyá men did not
 remove, whereas their absolutely naked women did, one can ex-
 pect the rather coarsely naïve natives to regard its presence as
 particularly ugly. Yet it is scarcely satisfactory to assume that
 it is only man's innate pleasure in a smooth skin which has
 prompted the unclothed native to carry on such energetic destruc-
 tive warfare against all body hair. There is no lack of reasons
 why it often seems annoying. People say that even insects which
 are not eaten as lice are get into the beard, underarm, and
 pubic hair and mat it down, just as in our case bees in particular
 became entangled there; people remember the tubercles and
 blisters on perspiring skin, which are doubly sensitive in hair,
 the uncleanness caused by blood and dirt, the convenience of
 attack for underbrush as well as for the pugnacity of one's fellow
 men, and thus they find many situations in which the body hair
 of a naked person may cause more annoyance than pleasure. On
 [517] the other hand, the pastime and enjoyment which plucking the
 hair and working over the bodies with small implements provide
 people in lazy hours must also be given their due. Finally, it is
 [826] perhaps not entirely irrelevant that hair and feathers are regarded
 as a sort of plant growth. The word for hair and feathers among
 [811] the Bakaïrf, and probably also in other languages, was originally
 [192] the same as forest, and the concepts are basically related, regard-
 less of whether the vegetative was taken from the corporeal, or
 vice versa. Hair and plants grow; they are also cleared away,
 at least the short weeds.

I should like to put foremost, however, a simple motive
 operating daily. Just as skin and hair belong together, I am
 thinking, in association with the custom of plucking, of a con-
 nection with the other custom of body painting, of cosmetics,
 which Joest maintains is older than bathing. For the painting of

[text continues on p. 164]

/270 cont./

000 Civilized man today begins even his first bungling efforts in the drawing art with triangles, squares, circles, and with these and similar figures our ancestors developed the science that is regarded as the highest; he does not see lines and geometric figures anywhere around him in nature -- therefore, he concludes, these fundamental concepts have sprung from his own rich inner self. That they could have originated from the models of pubic coverings, bats, or fish seems to him not only unworthy, but also a ridiculously roundabout course. For what is simpler than drawing a triangle? What is simpler, I reply, than counting to five? Even now the Bakairi explains each triangle that I draw for him as a picture of the uluri; he cannot yet count things without the help of his fingers. The number word "5" = hand, which is still found among many primitive peoples, corresponds exactly to the uluri - triangle; in both cases the inner perception of the pattern or the abstraction is derived only from the object, in both the concrete original has asserted its rights for a long time. Neither the facility with which we toss these ideas about nor the fact that the meaning of our number words has evaded all the probings of philology proves that our ancestors followed a course different from that of primitive peoples.

The teacher of geometry today certainly need not take particular pleasure in an uluri in order to sketch a triangle. The uluri is a sort of archaeopteryx of mathematics. How should the flying bird appreciate the fact that it is descended from the creeping or, at best, fluttering reptiles? Nevertheless the bird's inability to understand this origin does not prove the least thing against it. In the same way nothing is proved if we who are excellent flyers in the heights of mathematics can scarcely imagine that earlier human beings were unable to rise to the minor achievement of producing a simple triangle by themselves.

*171 Use of the ornamentation. On the weapons used -- there were
411 only bows and arrows -- painted designs were scarcely applicable.
531 The throwing stick, too, was decorated only with plaiting around it; a cork cone that was mounted on an arrow shaft as a tip exhibited the decoration of the mereschu design, cf. the illustration, page 91.

B /338 cont./

*171 between father and child; the child is a duplication of him, the
846 father has become double, and, for the sake of the helpless,
irrational creature which represents a miniature edition of him-
self, he must himself behave like a child who must not come to
harm. Supposing that the child dies during the first days, how
[753] could the father who is filled with such ideas and who has eaten
[761] indigestible things doubt that he himself is at fault, especially
B since all sickness arises through the fault of another? What we
●[811] call "pars pro toto" dominates popular belief everywhere with
respect to sorcery or healing magic, although I do not believe
that the sorcerer /339/ has a clear image of a "part" with which
he is working. The "couvade" is carried out according to the
same logic, except that here is a case where the whole intercedes
for the "part." It is all the same whether I poison the hair of the
enemy and thereby cause him to waste away, or whether, to the
detriment of the child which has become detached from me, I
eat food that it might not tolerate at all or at least not during the
days when the separation takes place.

B
*171 Burial. All the tribes of the Kulisehu bury their dead; the
764 body lies in west-east in such a way that the head looks toward
the rising sun. (According to the statements of the Kamayurá,
the Suyá bury their dead in a squatting position, the head with
the feather ornament bent back and the eyes turned toward the
setting sun.) The grave is on the village plaza. Among the
Mehinakú we saw in front of the festival hut a heap of brush
under which, at a shallow depth, the grave pit was said to be
located; fat beetles were crawling out of holes in the ground
and the place was alive with flies. Among the Auetó a square
[764] in front of the festival hut was staked off with thick, low posts
connected by plaiting. It is photographed on Plate 15 /see p. 253/;
I do not know whether it is a coincidence that the two sinuated
sides of the square resemble the characteristic shape of the handle-
plate of the throwing board. Among the Yaulapiti we saw a
square grave fence.

/348/

Chapter XIII.

ooo

Science and Legend of the Bakaïrf

I. The Basic View.

Man need not die. Knowledge of the existence after death. Explanation of nature by means of stories. Animals = persons. Animals actually furnish culture, hence same explanation carried over for unknown origins. Origin of explanatory story. Celestial bodies, the oldest things, and animals. Significance of the Milky Way. Transformation. Men from arrows, women from maize pestles. Keri and Kame and the ancestor legend. The twins and their mother are not profound personifications.

[76] When in the course of making my linguistic recordings I gave Antonio* the sentence, "everyone must die," he was silent for

[113]

* Bakaïrf-Grammatik /Bacairi Grammar/,
p. 185.

some time, to my astonishment. There ensued the same long pause which I always had to cope with when I presented him with one of those abstractions so familiar to us, but so foreign to him.

[81]

I learned then for the first time that the Bakaïrf /Bacairi/ does not know "must," he has not yet reached the point of deducing a general necessity from a series of always identical, recurring phenomena; quite specifically, however, he does not understand that man must die. He is still far from the thought which we memorize in the lowest classes of the Gymnasium, ** "nemo morietur"

** As a boy I refused to believe it at heart and for many years, until I became more intimately acquainted with the nature of death, clung stubbornly to the hope that I might perhaps be an exception and not die, as is otherwise customary in the history of the world.

/349 cont. /

761 the other hand, the process of the separation of soul and body is
 774 not; he experiences it day after day, as we have seen, when
 775 the shade /Schatten, "shadow, shade"/ hastens away in the dream
 828 and leaves his body behind in the hammock. Ordinary death is a
 deep unconsciousness (coma) brought about by the poison which
 the sorcerer administers, and it differs from sleep only in the fact
 that the shade hastens too far away to be able to return. Only the
 medicine man who poisons himself returns to life. The experi-
 ences of the shade during sleep were already "real"; hence its
 "experiences" after death are just as "real." One is familiar
 with this reality, which is merely life in another place, from
 daily experience and has it amply confirmed by the deceased,
 with whose shades our own communicates during the dream,
 and by the sorcerers who occasionally visit the realm of the dead;
 in the latter Hamlet may find the wanderers who return from the
 regions of the unknown country. To die to sleep, no more /cited
 in English/.

775 The shades of the dead Bakairi go to heaven to the ancestors.
 Heaven is first of all not the land of the future, but of the past,
 the old ones are still there where all history began. The heaven
 [772] in which the first Bakairi lived lay beside the earth in former
 times, and one could easily get over to it. Too many people
 died there, however, /350/ so the people moved to earth, and
 heaven rose up to where it is now and where the animals, the
 places, and the things which occur in the old stories may be seen
 to this day. "Everything remained as it was." "There were al-
 ways Bakairi, but in the beginning there were very few." One
 • [811] need only hold fast to a few specific points, and one will recog-
 nize, in spite of all flights of fancy and in spite of all the elabora-
 tion by tradition, a core of naïve, sound logic in the Indians'
 explanation of nature.

811 The Indians know no "must." They regard every occurrence
 in nature as a unique occurrence, or more correctly as a
 unique action. Indeed, laws are in fact known only as the result
 of the common work of many -- those who live and have
 lived. And as long as there are no laws and at
 best only habits, each individual is at the center of the

/350 cont./

811 universe, which represents only the totality of his personal impressions. It is not the natural phenomenon as such, with its conditions, that is the object of contemplation, but the impression that one receives from it; a story is sufficient to explain it. We recognize the same situation in the language; each species has its name, but the number of superordinate terms is extremely small. Therefore the number of divisions and pigeonholes is small; hence it does not matter much if a thing falls out of one compartment and into another. It is definitely noted, something special has happened, but there is no inherent impossibility anymore.

Let us make a comparison with something seen indistinctly. Far off on the forest path we see something which we are not yet in a position to recognize clearly. Everyone sees what he expects to see -- a stone, a deer, a heap of wood, a woman messenger, whatever it might be. It moves us if one of the shapes in the woods turns into another before our eyes, but -- and therein lies the great difference -- we do not believe in a transformation, but rather conclude that we were mistaken at the first glance, because we forthwith sacrifice our perception to the universal laws known to us, which absolutely exclude the former possibility. In the case of a striking illusion, however, we might realize that our obstacle does not exist for an ignorant person. I heard of a case where a fleeing Negro slave was pursued, and he ran into a small thicket, a capão; people looked for him in vain and found only a large jabutí turtle. The leader of the people put the turtle on his horse, but on the way let it fall out of fright and set it free; the entire company then swore that the Negro had turned into the turtle. When, despite a careful search, the slave was not found and only the turtle was to be discovered, this personal experience was decisive. The fact simply existed; if it was unusual, it could easily be explained by saying that the Negro was a sorcerer.

/351/ The reason that all "unusual" things can be explained simply as magic is because the idea of lawfulness is lacking. One is not yet in a position to be sharp-sighted. In fact, the more unusual the occurrence, the more one likes to hear it related and the more firmly it will therefore be believed.

/351 cont./

772 ways of life, to which the Indian is limited, can at best merely indicate to man the position of primus inter pares. To be sure, the animal does not have bow and arrow and maize pestle, but that is the chief difference in the eyes of the Indian, and that is why the men arose from arrows, the women from maize pestles, but it does have, like man, important tools, for example, such as teeth and claws, which, indeed, he takes away from it.

825 Moreover, the Indian lacks our division into species, insofar as the one does not interbreed with another. This distinction, which /352/ experience certainly makes easily recognizable, is again completely obliterated because the barrier based on our anatomical knowledge falls away. Let us consider for a moment what our popular belief is capable of concerning this error; here one is confronted with a genuine mouse-skin, a genuine dog-foot, etc. If the Indian can explain something by the crossing of different species of animals or by that of animal and man, nothing prevents him from asserting it; on the contrary, he will see proof of it and merely conclude that such things no longer happen now because they are no longer necessary. Today, our learned men say, there is no longer generatio aequivoca, but at one time it surely occurred. The difference is all the more obliterated since the native is obliged to use the convenient explanatory principle of transformation in the widest latitude. Finally, he does not concern himself further about reproduction within the species, since the child is nothing but the father; the species or the tribe is like a single individual, which always appears under the same name; various subspecies, for example, the jaguar cats, large and small and differing in color, are brothers. Each of these "jaguars," however, appear by name, "campo fox," "deer," "ant bear" -- in all kinds of stories and no one asks whether it is, say, campo fox "V" or campo fox "XXIII." It is also precisely the same for the human forefathers in the ancestor legends; the women are usually taken as given, and the fellow tribesmen who accompany them always are.

772 I repeat, we are justified in using the expression "anthropo-
 ● 811 morphize" only as a schema, and it becomes false if one tries to

/352 cont./

B
792 interpret it as though the Indian says, "I am a human being and
● 811 let the animals behave like human beings too." The reverse,
B
[186] that human beings are animals, also occurs, and, to be sure, in
B
[171] the good and bad sense. The Trumaí are water animals because
BO
[827] they sleep at the bottom of the river. The Bakaíri say this in
all seriousness. We likewise encounter among other tribes this
same belief in human beings who live in the water. The Bororó
maintain that if one chews certain leaves one can remain for
hours under the surface of the water and catch fish. I was unable
to learn anything more specific about the "water life" of the
Trumaí, except that they like to attack other tribes on the river
and supposedly throw captives in the water with their arms tied.
I do not know whether they were formerly river nomads, like the
Guató; at any rate, they first learned agriculture from their
neighbors. Whatever may have suggested this belief about them
B
[186] to the Bakaíri, it will not be vitiated by any conclusions that we
might draw on the basis of our natural laws, "but, after all, the
Trumaí are not animals, not fishes"; rather, the Bakaíri concludes
that because the Trumaí sleep in the river they are water animals,
and he mocks and despises them, as happens to every tribe with
strange customs. The Bororó pride themselves on the fact that
BO
792 they are red araras. They not only turn into araras after death,
811 /353/ as well as into certain other animals, not only are the
[775] araras Bororó and treated accordingly -- they also express their
relationship to the brilliant bird so cold-bloodedly that they desig-
nate themselves as araras as though a caterpillar were to say that
it is a butterfly and, in doing so, do not at all wish to give them-
selves merely a name completely independent from their nature.

B
792 Thus, the Trumaí are water animals because they have a
811 habit of water animals; the Bororó are araras because their dead
[771] are transformed into araras. One tries to interpret these and
similar phenomena by the confusion of names and things which
easily occurs in tradition. This is decidedly not the case among
our Indians. Though it may be readily conceded that, where the
basic view is present, such confusion automatically appears,
nevertheless the basic view, undoubtedly present, must be put

/353 cont. /

772 first as the main point. Or would we who lack it and who may also
811 experience confusion ever believe our geographers and historians
if they said that the Finns were a nation of tapeworms?

772 But if the essential distinction is absent, then the matter is
773 entirely different. Then there is nothing to prevent the campo-
811 fox, the nocturnal predator who has fire in his eyes glowing in the
dark, from giving this fire to human beings by striking it out of
his eyes. Or, to take a common variant of the ancestor legend,
there is nothing to prevent the jaguar from being the ancestor of
a cannibalistic tribe; for it is always emphatically reported that
this tribal ancestor "jaguar" killed and devoured the ancestors
of the local tribe, Bakairi or Paressi. I can state most emphati-
cally that my informant was firmly convinced that the evil ancestor
in question in the legend was a jaguar and was not merely called
that, although he shot with arrows. To say that the earlier time
in which the legend originated only symbolized and the descendants
confused names and things is a convenient supposition, but an un-
reliable one, for in that case the entire tradition would consist of
nothing but confusions. The earlier generation had the same basic
view as the present one. It explained the cannibalistic custom of
the neighboring tribe by descent from the jaguar for whom it is
characteristic to devour human beings. They did not know the
tribal ancestor, because he cannot be known by any tribe, although
he always must have been present. Since the essential distinction
between man and animal is lacking, they had no difficulty in
concluding that, because these people always devoured human
beings, our own forefathers, the tribal ancestor was therefore a jaguar,
and their causal requirement was satisfied -- which was much more
essential than the possible objection that today the son of a jaguar
is always a jaguar and that today, after all, no jaguar shoots with
bow and arrow as, of course, the ancestors of the hostile tribe did.

773 /354/ We understand that the Indian presents animals as though
811 they were persons when he reports their conversations, for one
825 knows that animals call to each other and communicate in loving
or threatening tones, but to furnish animals with cultural products
and implements seems to us to exceed the limit of what is per-
missible. In fact, according to the Indian ancestral legends, man

/354 cont./

773 is supposed to have acquired from the animals all kinds of goods
 811 that he possesses. The most diverse animals were "masters" or
 825 "owners" of them and the culture hero took them from them.

The master of medicinal tobacco and of cotton was the kinkajou, Cercoleptes caudivolvulus; the master of ordinary smoking tobacco, the electric eel; the master of the mandioca, the bagadú fish Phractocephalus; the master of sleep and the buriti hammock, the lizard; the master of the pots filled with water, from which, after they were broken, flowed the Ronuro and the Paranatinga, the ochobi river-snake; master of the sun, the king vulture, Sarcoramphus papa, and so on. How is such nonsense possible? All this, of course, is meant symbolically, says the wearer of the spectacles of civilization, and thus regards the question as answered. I can only laugh heartily when I think of the Indian hunters or fishermen, adhering to their view, as dealing with symbolic animals like the poets, painters, and, not to forget the lower spirits, the patentees of our civilized world inventing their trade-mark -- none of whom maintain close personal acquaintance with the originals of their symbolic animals.

773 No, Antonio and his fellow tribesmen would not have under-
 811 stood our type of symbols, let alone discovered some themselves. I do not deny that I was sometimes dumbfounded during our conversation when I was confronted with the simple-hearted belief in the reality of the "fairy-tale" animals and their culture in all its originality, but I was also so thoroughly convinced of its genuineness that I feel duty-bound to reject any explanation that does not fully acknowledge it. I also think the matter is simple enough to understand. The Indian has, in truth, obtained the most important parts of his culture from the persons whom we call animals, and even today he must take them away from them. Teeth, bones, claws, shells are his tools, without which he would be unable to make weapon or house or implement. He owes whatever he can accomplish to the piranha, the dogfish, the monkey, the capybara, the agutí, the giant armadillo, the mollusks, and the legend reports nothing about any of them because every child knows that these animals, the hunting of which is the most important prerequisite for those accomplishments, furnish the most

/354 cont. /

793 indispensable things to this day. What is more natural than that
811 he should, when he thinks about it, also derive from the animals
the fine and good things about whose origin he knows nothing or,
as in the case of cultivated plants, very little? What is more
natural than that the lizard, which sleeps for several months, pro-
vided sleep (it was drawn out of its eyes), /355/ or that the campo
fox, whose eyes shine in the dark when it goes forth for prey at
night, provided fire; that the sun, whose nature we shall become
acquainted with, was in the possession of the sovereign of the air,
the king vulture, whom the other vultures greatly respect, and
that water was in the possession of a large river snake? Along with
sleep the lizard must have also given up the hammock which goes
with it. Now it no longer has any; it was simply taken away, and
it was very angry. All those acquisitions were taken away by force
or deception; that is why the animals lack them nowadays. Thus
the causal requirement of the old, naïve hunters is very agreeably
satisfied, and, to be sure, altogether on the foundation of the
basic view that animals and human beings are merely persons with
different appearances and different equipment.

Modern research has succeeded in tracing a number of the
most dangerous illnesses to the presence of bacilli, and what is the
result? All kinds of diseases whose cause is still obscure are also
attributed to bacilli; thousands of people who have never even
seen a microorganism, to say nothing of having any idea as to
how the bad animals actually go about producing illness, now
suspect them in everything that they eat and seem as familiar with
them as with spiders and gnats. I should like to compare these
proved morbid agents with the animals which have truly fur-
nished the Indian with the most useful things, and those others that
exist only in legend with the fairy-tale animals to which, pro-
ceeding along the same trend of thought, he attributes the things
of unknown origin. It is a natural procedure to explain the un-
known exactly as one does the known.

Sun, fire, water, sleep are things whose first possessors must
simply be imagined; for them there is no historical tradition,
however dim. It may be different -- not necessarily -- with

/355 cont. /

773 cultivated plants. Medicinal tobacco, it is vaguely recalled,
 811 came from the north. Undoubtedly it was furnished by, let us say, a neighboring tribe, but the Bakaïrî have long since forgotten the actual, and in its details very ordinary, event; for many generations nothing has been known except that tobacco was first used for curing in the region where the kinkajou lives. The kinkajou is very rare in the region of the Bakaïrî; Antonio had never seen one, but he knew exactly how it looked, and his description, which was very exact in all its details, along with the name sawâri, made it possible for me to recognize it as the phonetically identical yawari of the Makuschî /Macusi/ in Guiana, about which Schomburgk adds in his report that the occurrence of the yawari, according to v. Tschudi, is known in Peru as far as the tenth degree south latitude! Thus the kinkajou, as the characteristic person for the region from which tobacco came, furnished tobacco, just as the king vulture, as the person who comes into the region of the sun, furnished the sun.

/356/ The kinkajou interested the Bakaïrî more than the missing neighboring tribe, and throughout the centuries it remained the same. It was the lord of the northern region, and whatever came from there, whether tobacco or cotton, originated from it; hunters who extended an expedition beyond the ordinary boundaries to the north found it there or it would itself pay occasional visits to the Bakaïrî in the south. The story of the origin of medicinal tobacco and cotton was treated according to the customary and natural schema that the characteristic animal was regarded as the original owner; if, in order to carry out the above comparison with reference to our similar procedure, we put the two diseases in the place of cotton and tobacco, then the legendary bacillus was the kinkajou. The story told about him is merely the answer to the question: "How does it happen that we had no tobacco in former times?" At first it was still known that "such and such a tribe gave it to us," then the name and specific circumstances were forgotten in the course of time and a later generation may perhaps still have heard, "We got it from someone in the region where the kinkajou lives," but such information was bound to fall into the customary schema the

/356 cont./

773 moment sweet curiosity asked further: "Where did those people
811 get their tobacco?" Then there was no better answer, assuming
the basic view, than: "From the kinkajou, of course," and
people were very satisfied.

In exactly the same manner, as we shall see, the origin of
the ordinary smoking tobacco is traced back to a fish which does
not occur in the Paranatinga, but lives in the "tobacco river,"
and the origin of mandioca to a fish likewise not found in the
Paranatinga, but which inhabited the "beijú river." Occasionally
I did not conceal my skepticism from Antonio -- not often, for,
like every believer, he was offended by doubts, the true core of
which he himself could not fail to recognize. Then he would
either maintain a hurt silence, or he would explain the present
condition as the result of magic, or -- and, to be sure, in most
cases -- he would simply say: "It is no longer like that now,
but it used to be."

"Once upon a time" (the constantly recurring paá of the Tupí
legends) is also the signature of the Indian "fairy tales." By far
the greatest number of the legends try to explain the origin of
something; thus they always deal with events in ancient times,
and since they are always to be explained only by something spe-
cial that happened, the view that there was once a time when
the extraordinary was the rule was bound to be established from
all this. With the most beautiful logic in the world they arrived
at situations where it was always found that the human behavior
of animals was the only way out, but a very excellent one. It
is very easy to understand the origin of the stories, frequently
spiced with a good deal of humor, if only one takes as the point
of departure the point which is proved; it is obvious that the
fact to be explained could not have led to the story, but rather
only the story to the fact.

000 /357/ In a fairy tale* that is very widespread on the Amazon

[113]

* Barbosa Rodriguez, "Poranduba Amazonense
/Amazon History/, " Annaes da Bibliotheca
Nacional, Vol. XIV, 2, page III, Rio de
Janeiro, 1890.

/359 cont./

821 For Antonio, who was clever enough to recognize the contradiction as soon as it was pointed out to him, was visibly hurt. "It may be," he finally declared sullenly, "that fire was added later through magic; in olden times there was none there." He is wrong about that, however. The heat was not added by magic, as Antonio thinks, but on the contrary, was conjured away. Nevertheless, present-day Bakairí science is rooted in the belief that sun and moon are feather balls, and no matter when or where it may have arisen, it furnishes us with a good example for understanding the thinking of the Indians.

811 It is sufficient for the explanation that a thing looks like
821 another, more familiar one. The sun is a feather ball the moment one finds that it looks more like that than like a blazing fire. Even if the conclusion is one by analogy, it is fully convincing on this level, and the further explanations about the growing darkness and the course in the sky develop organically from the stimulus which has now been given. We say that there cannot be any animals up there, hence the heavenly bodies are not animals; the Bakairí, on the other hand, sees the animals or the feathers and does not ask whether they are there, but merely how they got there.

821 I obtained no information about comets; Antonio simply remarked disdainfully: "They are supposed to bring harm to the Portuguese (the Brazilians are named only in this way), they don't do anything to the Bakairí." As for the planets, I was given only the name for Venus, which could not be translated.

[153] Antonio was excellently informed about the heavens. He also understood the nature of my star map without any trouble. The first time I pointed out a few constellations to him, we went outside and looked for them in the sky. We returned to the room and he immediately found Sirius on the map. It along with Orion, Aldebaran, and the Pleiades are regarded as belonging together in a group. Orion is a large rack on which mandioca is dried, the larger stars are the knobs of the posts, and thus Sirius marks the end of a large cross-beam by means of which the rack is held from the side. The Pleiades, apparently the starting point of the entire conception, are a heap of grains of flour that have fallen to one

/421 cont. /

171 in the color word for red, nor the word for the white clay in the
192 color word for white. I believe that the dyestuffs are far older
196 than the need for distinguishing them according to their colors.

[193] This is probable for the Bakaïrî because of two points: first, the color adjectives, with the single exception of "red, orange," do not belong to the inventory of the Karaiben base-language; secondly, their construction according to the schema r-stem-éng bears the stamp of a more recent formation.

000 I may doubtless also be permitted to use such a situation to support the earlier argument about the origin of personal color ornamentation (see pp. 172 ff.). No matter how ancient and innate the joy of color may assuredly be, nevertheless the circumstance that a need to distinguish the colors of the dyestuffs with words did not manifest itself until late speaks in favor of the view /422/ that colored ornamentation was not first used on the body for the sake of the colors. Since whatever was worn on the body as trophies or for practical purposes was actually distinguished by varying colors, which must have given pleasure, people quite naturally came to want to use them also for enjoyment, and from this time on the earliest distinctions by means of names for colors began, within these, in turn, the first certainty was gained also for the colors that were fashioned, whereas the need for distinguishing green and blue was satisfied by words which were still vague, such as "parakeet-colored."

171 One more thing must not be forgotten. The Indian does not
192 form general judgments, such as "the trees are green, the sky is
811 blue." Nothing induces him to analyze this view presented to him by the external world; it is of no interest to his person in any activity and is something taken for granted, such as that water is wet. What does interest him in making distinctions according to color is animals and plants. His principal application of the color names acquired is here and it is necessary to find out here how he proceeds with color names in his own usage.

171 With this in mind I looked through the list of animal names
192 in the glossary of Martius, in which some 1300 have been col-
825 lected from the total literature. "Parakeet-colored," cugui, for "blue and green" is used only a single time in the case of a